

**REMARKS**

Claims 28-29, 33, 35, and 37-39 are currently pending in the present application, with Claims 1-27, 30-32, 34, 36, and 40 being canceled, and Claims 23-27 withdrawn from consideration. Reconsideration and reexamination of the claims are respectfully requested.

The Examiner rejected Claims 1-9, 12-16, 19, 22, and 40 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Baskett (U.S. patent no. 6,333,672). This rejection is moot with respect to the canceled claims.

The Examiner rejected Claims 17, 18, 28, 29, 33, 35, and 37 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baskett in view of applicants' admitted prior art. This rejection is moot with respect to the canceled claims and respectfully traversed with respect to the pending claims.

Claim 28 is directed to a digital-to-analog circuit employing a plurality of current switches that, as previously discussed, include a cascode circuit having supplied thereto trickle current at the outputs of the switching transistors. By implementing the cascode circuits with trickle currents, the switching time of the transistors can be reduced, and parasitic capacitance (and hence the Miller Effect) can be reduced or eliminated. As recited in Claim 28, the multiple unit cells are summed together into a load resistor to make up a high-resolution DAC. The use of the cascode circuits with trickle currents as unit cells in a DAC improves the performance of the DAC by providing a faster overall operating speed and improved accuracy.

As previously communicated, Baskett is directed to a method for maintaining differential input transistors. As the Examiner acknowledges, Baskett does not contain any disclosure of digital-to-analog circuitry or using multiple units of current cells for switching purposes. The Examiner points to page 2 of the present application as motivation for incorporating the current

switch of Fig. 1 in Baskett into a plurality of unit current cells of a DAC, and that such a combination teaches the invention claimed by Claim 28. This is respectfully traversed.

First, Applicants note that Fig. 1 of Baskett is illustrated only as a reference to prior art, and that Baskett is actually directed to circuitry disclosed in Fig. 3 of Baskett. Baskett does not provide any disclosure or suggestion as to the use or applications of the current switch shown in Fig. 1; rather, Baskett teaches that "new" logic families do not have the supply rail potential headroom to support the current switch of Fig. 1 (see column 1, line 61 to column 2, line 3). While current summing DACs are known, Applicants respectfully submit that it is in hindsight of the present application that the incorporation of the trickle current cascode circuit as unit cells in a DAC is obvious. The Examiner's logic would seem to suggest that combinations of improved components with a known system is never patentable, contrary to standing patent law. Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's position that either Baskett or summing DACs provide any motivation whatsoever for employing trickle current cascode circuitry within the unit cells of a summing DAC, as claimed by Claim 28, and that the Claim 28 (and all claims dependent thereupon) are not anticipated by or obvious in view of Baskett.

The Examiner rejected Claims 20, 21, 38, and 39 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baskett. This rejection is moot with respect to the canceled claims and respectfully traversed with respect to the pending claims. Claims 38 and 39 depend from Claim 28; accordingly, for the reasons stated above, Applicants respectfully submit that 38 and 39 are also not anticipated by, nor obvious in view of, Baskett.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to

withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue. If it is determined that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number given below.

In the event the U.S. Patent and Trademark office determines that an extension and/or other relief is required, applicant petitions for any required relief including extensions of time and authorizes the Commissioner to charge the cost of such petitions and/or other fees due in connection with the filing of this document to Deposit Account No. 03-1952 referencing docket no. 535352003600.

Dated: June 20, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By 

David T. Yang

Registration No.: 44,415

MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP

555 West Fifth Street, Suite 3500

Los Angeles, California 90013

(213) 892-5587